



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## NOTES OF CASES.

**Telegraph Companies—Effect of Federal Post Roads Act—Postal Telegraph Co. v. City of Portland, 228 Fed. 254.**—The principal case after citing *Williams v. Talladega* (226 U. S. 404) and *Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Gottlieb* (190 U. S. 412), laid down the following principle: The Federal Post Roads Act (July 24, 1866, chap. 230, 14 Stat., 221, Comp. St., 1913, secs. 10072-10077), granting the right to telegraph companies to use the military and post roads of the United States for their poles and wires, is permissive in character only, and does not create corporate rights or privileges to carry on the business of telegraphy, which are derived from the laws of the State under which the company is incorporated, and the State is not by reason of such act prevented from taxing the real or personal property of the company within its borders, nor from imposing a license tax upon the right to do a local business within the State.

**Banks and Banking—Forged Indorsement on Check—Recovery of Money Paid—Swan-Edwards Co. v. Union Sav. Bank (Ga.), 87 S. E. 825.**—The syllabus in the principal case was written by the court and is as follows: “A bank is presumed to know the signature of one of its depositors, and therefore cannot recover from a bona fide holder for value money paid by the bank upon a check to which the drawer’s signature was forged, unless it appears that the holder, by his own negligence, contributed to the success of the fraud practiced, or his conduct had a tendency to mislead the drawee, who was himself free from fault. *Woods v. Colony Bank*, 114 Ga. 683, (2), 685, 40 S. E. 720, 56 L. R. A. 929; 2 **Michie on Banks and Banking**, § 147, p. 1196, and cases there cited. Any seeming conflict in principle between this ruling and the ruling in *Woods v. Colony Bank*, *supra*, disappears on examination of the particular facts in that case.”

**Carriers—Delivery of Goods—Liability—Bill of Lading—Killingworth v. Norfolk, etc., R. Co., 87 S. E. 947.**—The North Carolina Supreme Court in the principal case held that a carrier of property which by the terms of the bill of lading is deliverable to the shipper’s order is liable for its value to the true owner if he delivers it to the consignee or any one else without such order.

The court in the principal case used the following language and cited the following authorities: “It was the plaintiff’s duty, and not the defendant’s, to procure the indorsement of the trust company, or else to write to the consignor and get authority for the delivery of the goods to him. It is well settled that a bill of lading must be